



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tion of a shoe company. In the treaty it was stipulated that there should be no liability for any but the offense surrendered for. The alleged house was in fact a store, the burning of which was statutory arson in Iowa, but not arson at all in Canada. *Held*, the action of the Canadian authorities in giving over the prisoner was conclusive and habeas corpus was refused.

INDIANS—CAPACITY TO SUE—EJECTMENT—JOHNSON V. LONG ISLAND R. CO., 56 N. E. 992. (N. Y.).—Plaintiff, a member of the Montauk tribe of Indians, brought action in ejectment on behalf of himself and any members of the tribe who would come in and contribute to the expense. *Held*, that Indian tribes are wards of the State and generally speaking are possessed of only such rights to appear and litigate in courts of justice as are conferred on them by statute, Vann and Landon, J. J., dissent.

Where the jurisdiction depends on the subject matter of the controversy and not upon the status of the parties, the weight of authority seems to favor the right of an Indian to a standing in both the United States courts and the State courts. *Wiley v. Keokuk*, 6 Kan. 94; *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 U. S. 356; *Dred Scott v. Sandford*, 19 How. (U. S.) 403.

INTERNAL REVENUE—STAMP TAX—BONDS OF SALOON KEEPERS—UNITED STATES V OWENS, District Court, E. D. Missouri, Fed. Rep. 160, Page 170.—The question presented by the demurrer to the information in this case is whether a dramshop keeper's bond, given pursuant to the provisions of the State of Missouri, is subject to the stamp tax of 50 cents imposed by the war revenue act of 1898 (*Inter Alia*) upon all "Bonds of any description, except such as may be required in legal proceedings not otherwise provided for in this section."

Held, that a bond given by a saloon keeper, as one of the conditions of the granting by the State of a license, is an instrumentality employed by the State to execute and enforce its own laws in the exercise of its police powers, and does not require an internal revenue stamp, under the war revenue act of 1898. The most notable point in this case is the fact that the Court construes the bond as a part of the license. It is a well established rule that the license itself is exempt from the stamp tax. The court maintains that the license does not express the entire contract between the State and saloon keeper; but that the bond and license taken together, constitute the contract or license, therefore, as part of the license, is not liable to be taxed.

JUDGMENT—BAR—LIBEL AND SLANDER—CORPORATIONS—UNION ASSOCIATED PRESS V. HEATH, 63 N. Y. Supp. 96.—The Associated Press had published a libel on the Union Associated Press by sending it to its correspondents. For that publication a recovery was had against the Associated Press by the Union Associated Press. The defendant in this case was a publisher to whom the Associated Press had sent the libel, and he had republished it. *Held*, that the judgment against the Associated Press was no bar to a recovery against him. Van Brunt, P. J., and McLaughlin, J., dissenting.

Though the libel be the same, yet a different publication will give another cause of action. Every publication must be regarded as a new and distinct injury. *Wood v. Pangburn*, 75 N. Y. 498. A recovery for the wrong by the first publisher of a libel is not a satisfaction for the second publication. *Wood v. Pangburn* (supra). The dissenting justices maintain that the recovery against the Associated Press precludes further recovery from other publishers, as the act of sending the article, and the actual publication of it by the recipient, constitute a simple wrong, for which one recovery would be a complete satisfaction as to all. *Knapp v. Roche*, 94 N. Y. 329; *Lord v. Tiffany*, 98 N. Y. 412. The prevailing opinion seems supported by the greater weight of authority.